

RIC 2 – Regional Call Logger – Optional and Exploratory – Not Required to Join ISICS

- Look at potential for cost sharing of how this could work.
- Wes from Comtech in Minnesota
 - Minnesota needed a logging solution
 - Sharing resources has worked well after some initial start-up issues.
 - Some agreements are required for governance.
- Recordings can be restricted by county or agency.
- Would this be a separate logger from what is already in PSAPs and dispatch?
- Retention policies would need to be worked out.
- Concerns with cross-vendor compatibility.
- Are there legal requirements?
- Maintenance costs need to be considered.
- Wright County can host, could generate any MOA needed

RIC 2 – Interstate Interoperability

- Minnesota – 800 MHz statewide system.
- South Dakota – VHF statewide system.
 - New build-out beginning and scheduled for completion around 2023-2025. They are sticking with VHF
- Nebraska – VHF statewide system.
- Wisconsin – VHF statewide system.
- Iowa – 700 MHz statewide system (ISICS).
- There are likely current county-to-county agreements that may not cover all communications needs if more than two agencies are involved.
- Cannot expect all agencies to have multiband radios or having all channels/talk groups programmed in to subscriber units.
- South Dakota and Minnesota have dispatch ready to patch the two statewide systems together assuming that there is overlapping coverage in the neighboring state.

Sample use cases:

- Car chase that:
 - Starts in one state, moves to another and/or spans multiple counties.
 - Interstate interop talk groups could be an option.
 - Given frequency, this may be a good option.
 - This could be a semi-permanent patch to facilitate steady-state operations.
 - Try to streamline and limit the variances in processes if possible.
 - Could continue some current practices of sharing frequencies.
 - Cross-patching is Ok if it done properly
 - Can be done very rapidly.
 - Audio quality is good.
 - Solution needs to be simple.
 - Knowledge of planned events and any talk groups/channels that are being used can make awareness of available resources clearer.

- Access to neighboring states' talk groups could be beneficial for medical transports especially.
 - Table top exercise would be great to verify thoughts discussed here.
 - Starts in one state, and moves in and out of a neighboring state.
 - Much of the above notes will probably apply.
- HAZMAT scenarios that:
 - Are near a state border.
 - Can grow upscale very quickly.
 - Still have to ensure local ops work in conjunction with interop talk groups.
 - ICS is vitally important to tie to situation.
 - Tying networks together could be good for incident command.
 - TAC channels and talk groups would be needed for patching to neighboring statewide system.
 - Talk group sharing is helpful for many of these scenarios as well depending on scale.
 - HAZMAT scenarios that are ten miles or more into a neighboring state.
 - Much of what is stated above applies here.
 - Talk group sharing and NIFOG channels useful when out of range of home network.
 - Education of users on NIFOG is important.
 - An understanding of getting connectivity on the fly is important.
 - Having representative from outside agency paired with Iowa entity could help.
 - Much connectivity/LMR signals will carry 20 miles into neighboring state if tower is in bordering county.
- Water rescues outside of a metropolitan area
 - Similar concepts with other scenarios.
- Short and long-duration flooding.
 - ICS plays a role
 - Larger and longer events will likely require patching of networks.
 - Small events could be handled locally.
 - Much of previously noted concepts apply here.
- Severe weather reporting to the National Weather Service.
 - Can become an overload at critical times for NWS and dispatch.
 - Judicious use would be necessary
 - Otherwise it would get turned down.
 - NWS will call local dispatch via phone or LMR for answers in other states and in Iowa.
 - State Radio in Iowa is required to relay messages now.
 - Some NWS offices talk to people in-field on a regional talk group.
 - Some NWS offices will call dispatch.
 - Could be used to supplement current practices
 - WebEOC is used now along with NWS Chat.
 - Phones work well now.
- Strong desire for a table top exercise.

GoToMeeting Chat

Names of agencies and people have been removed. This chat pertained to the intended exploratory optional regional call logger discussion.

It was discovered during the call, that GoToMeeting does not necessarily make answering questions via chat easily accomplished. Some questions were not answered or incompletely answered during the meeting. Any addendums to the original text used to answer questions are denoted with blue font. Names and respective agencies have been changed to user designations with blue font. Basic spelling corrections have been made to the text.

1:48 PM: Me: Conference line is open everyone.

1:49 PM: User1 to Organizer(s): Can you make me the presenter?

1:49 PM: Me: Done.

1:59 PM: Me: Hi everyone. The conference line is open.

2:35 PM: User2: I like the idea of whoever wants on first, buys and then as other counties come on they basically reimburse the initial counties.

I think another thing that needs to be addressed is different user levels. If I am wanting on, but only for purposes of interoperability, do I pay the whole cost?

I do like the pay per talkgroup model as well, but we would need to establish the total amount of users prior to paying for the startup cost, and then in the future, if anyone else came on I assume we would have to do the same cost reimbursement as the first type I mentioned.

2:36 PM: User3: I would agree User2, IF a county want to put School, Public Works al that on they should pay more than a county that has LE, EMS and Fire only.

2:38 PM: User2: I don't think the cost share considering the amount of changes that will occur are going to be pretty either way.

2:38 PM: User2: Have we asked the state to support this at all?

2:40 PM: Me: User2, this is an initial exploratory call regarding the matter. As of today, there is not an official request as far as I am aware.

2:40 PM: User2: Ok thanks.

2:47 PM: User2: I guess that answers my question on those only seeking interoperability functionality. We can just integrate it into our own recorder.

Added by SWIC: Yes if you have room on the device. You may already be recording various interoperability channels or other things on your recorder. In some cases as agencies have

reviewed what is being recorded, they decide that those recordings are no longer necessary and have repurposed that available slot in the recorder to record conversations on networks like ISICS. Incorporating this recording into your current set-up could be the most cost-effective pending the evaluation of your current set-up.

2:56 PM: [User4](#): [User4's County](#) is not moving to the ISICS platform any time soon

2:59 PM: [User3](#): [User3's County](#) is interested at least in the interoperable channels in dispatch initially

3:01 PM: [User2](#): [Users's County](#) is interested in interoperability only and would not be interested in the regional logger at this time.

I would like some more information on the recommendation to have 2 recorders.

Added by SWIC: I'm not aware that any sort of recommendation of having two recorders has ever been made. This exploratory regional recorder call was to look at some of the nuances of implementing a regional recording system like they did in Minnesota. If there is room on your current recorder to handle any additional traffic from ISICS use, then that would probably be fine.

3:02 PM: Me: Thanks [User4](#), [User2](#) and [User3](#). No one is saying that you have to use ISICS for local operability. There are multiple ways to access the system for interoperability.

3:02 PM: Me: If all you desire is interoperability at this point, that is perfectly fine.

3:02 PM: [User2](#): Chris, would it make sense for this logger to be bigger than R2?

3:05 PM: Me: [User2](#), It's one of those things where if there was enough interest, possibly. [This response was moved up in the timeline since it was an answer to the question posed by User2 at 3:02 PM.](#)

3:03 PM: [User4](#): when is the cost for this going to be decided? Because I would have to introduce this to my Board, before I could even say we would opt in or not

3:06 PM: Me: [User4](#), the cost associated with a regional call logger is not something that is required to join ISICS. [Added by SWIC: If you have slots on your current recorder, then you would not need to worry about this.](#)

3:07 PM: [User2](#): [User2's County](#) needs to drop the call. Thanks everyone!

3:07 PM: Me: All that is needed to join ISICS is a compatible radio--P25 Phase II (TDMA), 700 MHz. Any encryption on the interoperable talk groups would be AES256.

3:07 PM: [User4](#): Let me re-word. The discussion I am hearing is deciding what the 'buy in' cost would be based on those getting on 'first'

3:08 PM: [User4](#): If 'down the line' [User4's County](#) did opt into the ISICS platform, would we 'miss out' on the first come buy in?

3:10 PM: Me: [User4](#), I don't want to speak out of line, but I don't think so. There are many, many ways to accomplish any type of call logging. A regional option is something that is starting to be explored.

3:11 PM: [User4](#): OK, thank you, Chris.

3:08 PM: [User3](#): But if we have to be interoperable when STATE drops LEA, Mutual Aid, etc. to the system rather than Analog now each county is required per code to be able to have that at minimum in Dispatch. [This message was moved down the timeline to help associate it with the response given at 3:13 PM.](#)

3:13 PM: Me: [User3](#), there will likely be a phase out period for LEA to give people time to adjust. Mutual Aid is a channel that is typically associated with VLAW31 ([155.475 w/ CTCSS tone of 156.7](#)). That is a NIFOG channel that is always going to be available for use via direct radio-to-radio communications. The ISICSB is exploring various ways to assist local PSAPs in joining ISICS if possible.

3:16 PM: [User3](#): Chris email me you info- [User3's email](#) then [User3](#) can get in conversation with you.

3:22 PM: [User5](#): Thank you for the questions